

Appl. No. 10/562,748
Amdt. dated May 22, 2007
Reply to Office action of March 23, 2007

filed in accordance with 35 U.S.C. 371 under the Patent Cooperation Treaty, the proper standard for determining the appropriateness of a restriction requirement is the unity of invention standard under 37 CFR 1.499. As explained in MPEP § 1893.03(d):

The basic principle is that an application should relate to only one invention or, if there is more than one invention, that applicant would have a right to include in a single application only those inventions which are so linked as to form a single general inventive concept.

A group of inventions is considered linked to form a single general inventive concept where there is a technical relationship among the inventions that involves at least one common or corresponding special technical feature. The expression special technical features is defined as meaning those technical features that define the contribution which each claimed invention, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art. For example, a corresponding technical feature is exemplified by a key defined by certain claimed structural characteristics which correspond to the claimed features of a lock to be used with the claimed key.

In the present case, both claim 1 and claim 21 include at least one common special technical feature, namely a magnet-based part (200) with reduced magnet weight. Therefore, the inventions defined by claims 1 and 21 are linked to form a single general inventive concept and meet the unity of invention standard. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the restriction requirement and examination of claims 1-28 on the merits.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge said fees to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, Order No. BRV 39291.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By /Aaron A. Fishman/
Aaron A. Fishman, Reg. No. 44682

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700
May 22, 2007

Appl. No. 10/562,748
Amdt. dated May 22, 2007
Reply to Office action of March 23, 2007